REMARKS

This paper is being provided in response to the Office Action dated September 15, 2010, for the above-captioned application. In this response, Applicants have amended claims 4, 9 and 14 to clarify that which Applicants consider to be the presently-claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed specification, consistent with the discussion herein.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative in the telephone discussion of January 10, 2011. During this discussion, claim amendments were discussed to distinguish the presently-claimed invention from the cited prior art references, in particular, the protocol format mapping between XMPP and CPIM protocol specifications described in the Miller reference. The amendments contained herein reflect the discussions with the Examiner, specifically clarifying the recited features concerning the nature of the different content of the first presence information and the second presence information. It is respectfully submitted that, in accordance with the discussion, the presently-claimed invention, as amended and discussed herein, is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art of record.

The rejection of claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 13-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Miller, et al. "XMPP CPIM Mapping draft-mill-erxmpp-cpim-00" (hereinafter "Miller") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,263,183 B1 to Klein et al. (hereinafter "Klein") is hereby traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims contained herein.

Independent claim 4, as amended herein, recites a gateway apparatus that connects a presence server of a first system and a second system providing another presence system. The gateway apparatus includes a receiver section that receives first presence information for a given user from one of: the first system and the second system when user presence information of the given user is changed. A converter section converts the first presence information to second presence information, wherein the second presence information is compatible with the other of: the first system and the second system, and wherein, independent of protocol format of the first presence information and the second presence information, content of the first presence information is different from content of the second presence information, the content of the first presence information including at least a first field having a first value that is different from a corresponding value of a corresponding field of the content of the second presence information, each of the content of the first presence information and the content of the second presence information corresponding to the change in the user presence information. A synchronizer section provides the second presence information to the other of: the first system and the second system, wherein the second presence information synchronizes the user presence information of the given user in the first system and the second system. Claims 5-7 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 4.

Independent claim 9, as amended herein, recites a presence display system including a presence server and a gateway apparatus that connects a first system, having the presence server, and a second system providing another presence system. The gateway apparatus includes a receiver section that receives first presence information for a given user from one of: the first system and the second system when user presence information of the given user is changed. A

converter section converts the first presence information to second presence information, wherein the second presence information is compatible with the other of: the first system and the second system, wherein, independent of protocol format of the first presence information and the second presence information, content of the first presence information is different from content of the second presence information, the content of the first presence information including at least a first field having a first value that is different from a corresponding value of a corresponding field of the content of the second presence information, each of the content of the first presence information and the content of the second presence information corresponding to the change in the user presence information. A synchronizer section that provides the second presence information to the other of: the first system and the second system, wherein the second presence information synchronizes the user presence information of the given user in the first system and the second system. The presence server manages the user presence information of the given user by at least one of: reporting the user presence information of the given user to the second system, via the gateway apparatus, when the user presence information of the given user is changed in the first system; and updating the user presence information of the given user in the first system when a report that the user presence information of the given user has changed is received from the second system via the gateway apparatus. Claims 10-13 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 9.

Independent claim 14, as amended herein, recites a method for connecting a first system, having a presence server, and a second system providing another presence system. The method includes receiving first presence information for a given user from one of: the first system and the second system, when user presence information of the given user is changed.

The method further includes converting the first presence information to second presence information, wherein the second presence information is compatible with the other of: the first system and the second system, and wherein, independent of protocol format of the first presence information and the second presence information, content of the first presence information is different from content of the second presence information, the content of the first presence information including at least a first field having a first value that is different from a corresponding value of a corresponding field of the content of the second presence information, each of the content of the first presence information and the content of the second presence information corresponding to the change in the user presence information. The method further includes providing the second presence information to the other of: the first system and the second system, wherein the second presence information synchronizes the user presence information of the given user in the first system and the second system. Claims 15-19 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 14.

Miller discloses mapping of extensible messaging and presence protocol (XMPP) to the common presence and instant messaging (CPIM) specification. The Office Action cites principally in Miller to the figure in section 2 showing an "XMPP Service," "CPIM Gateway" and "CPIM-Compliant Service" and to section 4.2.2 entitled "The Notify Operation".

Klein discloses a method and system for assigning tasks to workers. The Office Action cites to Klein as disclosing a synchronizer section, citing specifically to Figure 3, elements 76 and 78 of Klein.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants submit that Applicants' system is not directed to mapping between computer languages or protocols like that disclosed in Miller (i.e. mapping from XMPP to CPIM or vice versa) and that Miller's disclosed mapping from XMPP to CPIM or vice versa does not disclose the synchronizing of presence information of a user like that recited by Applicants. Applicants have amended the claims herein to clarify the distinctions between the disclosures of Miller and Klein with respect to Applicants' recited claims. Applicants' claims recite features corresponding to a synchronization of a change in user presence information of a given user between a first system and a second system and corresponds to a change in the content, rather than mapping between language or protocol, of the first and second presence information of the first system and the second system. Specifically, as discussed herein, Applicants have amended the claims to recite that, independent of protocol format of the first presence information and the second presence information, the content of the first presence information is different from content of the second presence information, the content of the first presence information including at least a first field having a first value that is different from a corresponding value of a corresponding field of the content of the second presence information, and each of the content of the first presence information and the content of the second presence information corresponding to the change in the user presence information.

Applicants submit that there is a clear distinction between actually changing content of a message and merely converting or mapping between protocols. In the present application, the actual content of the first presence information of a first system is physically changed, e.g., when one presence system indicates that a user has "arrived at work," this status is converted and transmitted to the second presence system as "in attendance" (see, e.g., page 30-32 and Figure 9

of the originally-filed specification). As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants have made amendments to specifically clarify the nature of the different converted content recited by Applicants with respect to first and second presence information corresponding to first and second systems, specifically, that independent of protocol format of the first presence information and the second presence information, content of the first presence information is different from content of the second presence information, the content of the first presence information including at least a first field having a first value that is different from a corresponding value of a corresponding field of the content of the second presence information.

Applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not teach or fairly suggest the above-noted features as recited by Applicants. Miller discloses mapping between two different systems that is disclosed is in relation to mapping between underlying protocols of the system, specifically XMPP and CPIM. That is, the CPIM gateway shown in section 2 of Miller provides a mapping of different fields between the CPIM and XMPP systems. There is no disclosure in Miller of converting the "content" of any of those fields. More specifically, referring to section 3.2.1 of Miller, it is stated that when sending messages from XMPP to CPIM, the XMPP "from" attribute maps to the CPIM "message source" field and the XMPP <body/> element maps to the CPIM "message" field. This is a direct mapping and there is no disclosure of adjusting the actual content of the <body/> element when mapping it to the "message" field to make the message compatible with the CPIM system. Miller does not in any describe or disclose the converting of presence information between two systems in which the content is changed to reflect changes in user presence information and synchronize the user presence information between the first and second systems, like that which is recited by Applicants.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Klein does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Miller with respect to Applicants' presently-recited claims. In Fig. 3, Klein discloses receiving notification of a change of presence entity state and notifying a watch of a change of presence entity state. Klein does not disclose, nor is Klein cited in the Office Action in connection with, Applicants' recited features that are discussed in connection with Miller. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller and Klein, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or fairly suggest at least the above-noted features as recited by Applicants. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Klein and further in view of U.S. Patent App. No. 2005/0068167 to Boyer et al. (hereinafter "Boyer") is hereby traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims contained herein.

The features of the independent claims are discussed above with respect to Miller and Klein. Claims 13 and 19 depend therefrom.

Boyer discloses a programmable presence proxy for determining a presence status of a user. The Office Action cites to Boyer as disclosing reporting updated presence information to buddies of a given user where the buddies are in the first system or the second system, citing specifically to paragraph [0025] of Boyer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Boyer does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Miller and Klein with respect to Applicants' presently-recited claims. Boyer does not disclose, nor is Boyer cited in the Office Action in connection with, Applicants' recited features that are discussed in connection with Miller and Klein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art, taken alone or in any combination, does not teach or fairly suggest at least the above-noted features as recited by Applicants. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Klein and further in view of Rosenberg, et al. "SIP Extensions for Presence" (hereinafter "Rosenberg") is hereby traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims contained herein.

The features of the independent claims are discussed above with respect to Miller and Klein. Claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 16 depend therefrom.

Rosenberg discloses extensions to Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for subscriptions and notifications of user presence. The Office Action cites to Rosenberg as disclosing an SIP-compliant IP telephone system and use of an SIP SUBSCRIBE method, citing specifically to sections 7.1 and 7.2 of Rosenberg.

Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Rosenberg does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Miller and Klein with respect to Applicants' presently-recited claims. Rosenberg does not disclose, nor is Rosenberg cited by the Office Action in connection with, Applicants' recited features that are discussed above with respect to Miller and Klein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art, taken alone or in any combination, do not teach or fairly suggest at least the above-noted features as recited by Applicants. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 508-898-8603.

Respectfully submitted,
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, LLC

Date: January 11, 2011

Donald W. Muirhead
Registration No. 33,978

Muirhead and Saturnelli, LLC
200 Friberg Parkway, Suite 1001
Westborough, MA 01581
Phone: (508) 898-8601
Fax: (508) 898-8602